

REMARKS

In response to an Office Action mailed May 26, 2005, the date for timely reply extending one month to expire on June 26, 2005, please accept our further comments regarding the interview of January 25, 2005, that was unintentionally omitted from inclusion with the Amendment and Response submitted on March 11, 2005. At the time of filing of this document, Claims 69-94 were pending; Claims 69-73, 83, 86-87, and 91-93 were amended; Claims 79-81, 99-90, and 94 were cancelled. Claims 95-98 were added.

Applicants note that an Interview Summary prepared by Examiner Hanley, copy attached, was made of record in PAIR.

The interview of January 25, 2005, was limited to the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 regarding claims 87-92. Agreement on the claims was not reached during the interview. However, the comments of Examiner Hanley and Examiner Witz were directed to clarifying what the screening method acts upon, namely a compound or extract, and what activity is quantified in the screening method particularly LPL activity. The Amendment and Response submitted on March 11, 2005, addresses the Examiner's rejections. The Examiners indicated that the language "at least a compound" and "slimming activity" were problematic. In addition, the invented screening method was discussed generally, along with the primary reference, Cook et al. relied upon by the Examiners. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the Amendment and Response submitted on March 11, 2005, and this Supplemental Response.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: June 9, 2005

By: Anne M. Murphy
Name: Anne M. Murphy
Reg. No.: 54,327
AMM:pll

Attachment:

Copy of Examiner's Interview Summary